

**An Econometric Analysis of Military Spending
and Economic Growth in South Africa**

by

Alvin Birdi and Paul Dunne

**Middlesex University Business School
The Burroughs
Hendon
London NW4 4BT
J.Dunne@mdx.ac.uk**

February 2001

This paper is based on research undertaken as part of a project on *Defence Industrial Restructuring, Conversion and Economic Growth in South Africa* funded by the Leverhulme Trust, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. It was presented at the 1999 *Econometrics for Africa Conference*, in Johannesburg and we are grateful to the participants for comments.

Introduction

There is considerable debate in the literature over the effects of military spending on economic growth in developing economies. Following the early cross country studies, using average values over time and simple correlation techniques, the application of econometric models provided a wide variety of studies, but no clear consensus over the results. What started to become clear was that to understand the dynamics of the relation between military spending and growth it was necessary to focus on relatively homogeneous groups of countries as well as undertaking case studies of individual countries (Dunne, 1996). This chapter provides a contribution to the corpus of case studies, by providing an analysis of South Africa, a particularly interesting focus of study because of the nature of its military industrial complex, the characteristics of the economy and the fact that it has undergone considerable change. In addition, the country has relatively high quality data for a developing economy.

While there have been some studies of the relation between military expenditure and economic growth in South Africa, noticeably a recent special issue of the journal *Defence and Peace Economics*, they are by no means exhaustive of the possibilities. This chapter aims to provide a critical review of the approaches taken in econometric analyses of the defence-growth nexus in South Africa and then to develop the analysis to overcome perceived deficiencies. New results are then provided using a cointegrating vector autoregressive (VAR) approach.

Historical Background

Military spending has played an important role in South Africa. During the apartheid period high military burden supported the system internally and externally as part of a military-energy industrial complex (Fine and Rustomjee, 1996). In anticipation of the 1977 UN arms embargo a state arms producer was ARMSCOR formed to develop domestic arms production capability and in 1982 entered the arms export market, having a policy of selling to all-comers. This represented a huge change as pre 1963 SA spent 70% defence budget overseas and by 1984 almost 100% procured domestically. With the end of the apartheid system and of the cold war there have been significant cuts in military spending. The decline started in 1989-90 with the start of abolition of apartheid, the establishment of civilian control of military, and the termination of nuclear weapons programme. 1989-93 was, however, one of worst economic recessions in SA history with negative GDP growth. Manufacturing declined but the external position improved with end of sanctions and there was commercialisation/privatisation of strategic industries Sasol/Arm Scor/Mosgas.

With the new ANC government came the Cameron Commissions report into arms exports, but also the voices of a number of hawks, the smell of political compromise and a defensive fight by the vested interests in the military industrial complex. This has seen pressures for increases in military spending. The present situation sees an improving economic situation, considerable debate over the level of military, and an end to its decline. A recent large procurement order with offsets has highlighted the debates (Batchelor and Dunne, 2000). One of the arguments in the policy debates concerned the possible negative impact of the cuts in military spending on growth.

This has made research on the role and impact of such expenditures an important target for research. Before moving on to review existing applied studies of South Africa, the next section considers the more general theoretical and empirical work.

Economic Effects of Military Spending

Theoretically, any evaluation of the impact of military spending on growth is contingent on the theoretical perspective used. Neoclassical models are generally supply side with a focus on the trade off between 'guns and butter. Keynesian models see military spending simply as one component of military spending and focus on the demand side, although when used in econometric models an aggregate production function does give them a neoclassical flavour. A group of institutional economists focus on the damaging impact of the military industrial complex on the economy and Marxists vary from the positive effects of the underconsumptionists, through preventing realisation crises to its possible negative impact on the profit rate (Dunne, 1990).

When we move to empirical analyses it is necessary to determine the level of abstraction at which the analysis is to be presented and to operationalise the theory to form an applied model. This leads to a variety of empirical work from applied econometric to more focussed institutional case study approaches. When statistical analysis is used it is generally with the neoclassical and Keynesian approaches, as these are most amenable to the creation of formal models. Some work adopts a more ad hoc approach. Studies differ in terms of the country coverage, whether time series or cross section, time period covered and the empirical methods used (Dunne, 1996). In general the empirical analyses have identified a number of channels by which military spending can influence the economy and both can be positive or negative. It can take skilled labour away from civil production, but on the other hand can train workers, particularly in developing economies where the military may provide valuable skills. It can take the best capital equipment from civil industry to produce a high technology enclave, on the other hand there may be positive externalities of the development of the military sector on the civil sector. It can lead to damaging wars, but may maintain peace and lead to economic benefits from more prosperous allies. It can stimulate demand in a stagnant economy and lead to growth, but may create bottlenecks in a constrained economy. Finally, it may slow down development through the fostering of a militaristic ideology, but on the other hand nationalist attitudes may increase effort and output and the military and ideology may be used to control the workforce. Clearly whether the overall effect is positive or negative is an empirical question and is likely to differ across countries (Dunne, 1996)

Following the ad hoc approach of Benoit's original study (Benoit, 1978), which found a positive effect of military spending on growth in developing countries, an impressive literature has been built up. This has used econometric analysis of single equation reduced form equations and simultaneous equation models that model both direct and indirect effects (Smith, 2000). In addition, macroeconometric models have been used to simulate the likely impact of changes in military spending at country and international level (Gleditsch et al, 1996).

Overall, the results tend to show an insignificant or negative impact of military

spending on economic growth in developing countries and a clearer negative impact in developed economies, through military spending being at the expense of investment rather than consumption. This does, however, hide the diversity of the literature. Much of the earlier cross-section analyses found sample selection to be important and this led to calls for more case studies. Time series analyses of individual economies and relatively homogenous groups of economies have improved the understanding, of the economic processes at work, but have also produced a variety of results. What is clear is that while cross-country studies can provide valuable general information it is important to build up more comprehensive case study analysis. The next section considers the analyses that have been undertaken for South Africa.

Analysing Military Expenditure and Growth in SA:

Econometric analyses of the relation between military spending and growth in South Africa have followed the different approaches in the literature. There are the neoclassical growth models, with the Feder-Ram model being estimated by McMillan (1996) and Batchelor, Dunne and Saal (1998). A Keynesian simultaneous equation model with an aggregate production function has been estimated by Roux (1996) and Dunne, Nikolaidou and Roux (2000). Finally, Dunne and Vougas (1999) analysed the relation between military spending and growth using Granger causality and cointegration techniques. There have also been attempts to use industrial level panel data, Birdi, Dunne and Saal (2000).

The simple Feder-Ram model has held something of a fascination for defence economists, mainly because of its ability to explicitly treat externality effects of the military on the non-military sector. In the basic model assume two distinct sectors military (M) and non-military (C), that labour L and capital K are the divisible inputs, and that the military sector has an externality effect on the rest of the economy.

$$\begin{aligned} M &= M(L_M, K_M) \\ C &= C(L_C, K_C, M) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= M + C \\ K &= K_M + K_C \\ L &= L_M + L_C \end{aligned}$$

Allowing input productivity to differ such that the ratios of the marginal productivities for the sectors are:

$$M'_K / C'_K = M'_L / C'_L = 1 + \delta$$

Military spending can then have two different effects the productivity differential δ and the externality effect ($\delta C / \delta M > 0$). Reformulating in terms of aggregate inputs, taking the total derivative of Q and then substituting and manipulating gives:

$$QD = \beta LD + \alpha (I / Y) + ((\delta / 1 + \delta) - C_M) MD (M / Q)$$

where $YD = dY/Y$; $LD = dL/L$; $MD = dM/M$

The coefficient on the last term is the sum of the externality and factor productivity differential effects of military spending. Following Biswas and Ram (1986) and assuming that the externality parameter is not C_M but $C_M (M/C)$ and is denoted θ allows us to write.

$$QD = \beta LD + \alpha (I / Y) + ((\delta / 1+\delta) - \theta) MD (M / Q) + \theta MD$$

Separate estimates of θ and δ can be obtained.

To operationalise the model for empirical application the instantaneous rate of change of the variables are replaced by their discrete equivalents giving:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_t/Y_{t-1} = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \Delta L_t/L_{t-1} + \alpha_2 I_t/Y_{t-1} + \alpha_3 \Delta M_t/M_{t-1} (M_t/Y_{t-1}) \\ & + \alpha_4 \Delta M_t/M_{t-1} \end{aligned}$$

Initially, these models were used on cross sections, but increasingly have been applied to time series for individual countries.

When this model was estimated using South African data for the period 1964-95 in Batchelor, Dunne and Saal (2000) it gave the following results:

Table 1: Aggregate Estimation Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-ratio	Using $\Delta K_t/K_{t-1}$ instead of I_t/Y_{t-1}	
			Coefficient	t-ratio
Constant	0.03	1.4	0.01	1.9
I_t/Y_{t-1}	-0.08	0.8	0.02	0.1
$\Delta L_t/L_{t-1}$	0.78	4.4	0.72	3.4
$\Delta M_t/M_{t-1} (M_t/Y_{t-1})$	-1.58	-0.4	-1.24	-0.3
$\Delta M_t/M_{t-1}$	0.07	1.1	0.05	0.4
	$\theta = 0.07$ and $\delta = -0.60$		$\theta = 0.05$ and $\delta = -0.54$	
	$R^2 = 0.587$; DW = 1.68		$R^2 = 0.52$; DW = 1.36	
	Serial correlation = 0.69 ;		Serial correlation = 2.76	
	Functional Form = 3.86;		Functional Form = 1.81;	
	Normality = 0.11;		Normality = 0.05;	
	Heteroscedasticity = 0.44		Heteroscedasticity = 0.23	
Joint LLR test for zero restrictions on military expenditure terms chi-squared 2:				
	0.48 (0.79)		3.65 (0.86)	
All chi-squared with 1 degree of freedom except normality test which is 2.				

These results suggest that economic growth in South Africa can be only partly explained by the model, although the specification seems to be reasonable according to the different statistical tests. The R^2 suggests that the equation only explains 59% of the variation in the dependent variable, which in a time series regression is relatively poor. In addition, only the employment variable is statistically significant at 5% significance level. This variable is the growth in non-agricultural labour which is

used to approximate the labour force. Surprisingly, the investment term is insignificant. The military spending coefficient estimates suggest a positive externality effect, but a negative size effect, but these are only significant at 10%.

There are of course problems of multicollinearity with an equation of this form particularly between the two military spending terms. This will mean that although the estimates are unbiased they are imprecise and unstable. One would expect a high F statistic, but low individual significance, which is what we observe. However, the joint test of zero restrictions on the military variables' coefficients cannot be rejected, suggesting that there is no significant impact of military spending on growth.

The problems with these results led to considerations of how they might be improved. There are a number of options that have been taken by researchers. They have used a more detailed model that identifies more sectors. One study of particular interest is McMillan (1992) who estimates a variation of the model for South Africa 1950-85. Batchelor and Dunne (1996) also present a model developed along these lines, while the study in Chapter 12 finds that the extended model provides improved result for Greece and Turkey. Another alternative is to consider the impact of military expenditure on the manufacturing sector alone, rather than the whole economy. When Batchelor, Dunne and Saal (1999) did this they found that the results for the manufacturing sector in South Africa were much better than for the aggregate data. Finally, the dynamics of the applied model can be considered. The move to a discrete model in the theory is somewhat ad hoc and it is possible that the processes may have a longer memory than allowed for in the derived model. Batchelor, Dunne and Saal, (1999) take the simple model for South Africa and use an ARDL estimation procedure to model the short run dynamics. This does improve the performance of the model, but the strange nature of the composite variables gives some concern.

This leads us to suggest that it is necessary to further investigate the dynamics of the relation between military spending and growth and that it is also worthwhile considering an analysis at the level of manufacturing as well as the aggregate economy. Opting for an approach that uses a structural model, we have seen the problems with using the Feder-Ram model, while the nature of the commonly used Keynesian model limits the scope for developing the dynamic specification. This suggests that need to consider a different approach and to use a different model. An obvious alternative is to use an aggregate production function model and this is developed in the next section.

Developing the Analysis

Taking the simple Cobb Douglas model

$$Q = A K^{\alpha} L^{\beta}$$

Which in log form is:

$$q = a + \alpha k + \beta l$$

We can simply introduce military spending to this equation:

$$q = a + \alpha k + \beta l + \gamma m$$

where m is the log of military expenditure. In addition we add in a dummy variable to take account of the effect of sanctions which basic data analysis suggests was an important factor. To develop the dynamics of the model we use a cointegrating vector autoregressive (VAR) approach to estimate it. This allows us to focus explicitly on determining the short run dynamics and long run properties of our structural model.

Treating this within a VAR estimation framework within Microfit 4.0 (Pesaran and Pesaran, 1997) and starting from an order 4 VAR we get a VAR (2) as the optimal lag length. Using unrestricted intercepts and no trends gives one cointegrating vector

$$z = 0.82 q + 1.86 k - 7.05 l + 1.23 m$$

Or

$$q = -2.27 k + 8.63 l - 1.51 m$$

(13.9) (41.3) (7.4)

where the asymptotic standard error are in brackets. The coefficient on military spending is negative, but the results are strange, with all coefficients insignificant and a negative sign on capital. Its persistence profile converges quickly, within 9 years, but the underlying error correction model is a very poor specification for a growth equation, though again there is a negative but insignificant effect of m .

$$\Delta q_t = 2.3 + 0.22 \Delta q_{t-1} + 0.11 \Delta k_{t-1} - 0.10 \Delta l_{t-1} - 0.03 \Delta m_{t-1} - 0.03 ECM_{t-1} - 0.02 DS$$

(1.6) (0.9) (0.4) (0.3) (1.0) (1.6) (2.2)

where ECM is the error correction term, DS the sanctions dummy and the values of the t ratios are in brackets.

The rather large coefficient on the labour terms is worrying and may suggest that we have the wrong dependent variable and may be estimating a labour demand equation. Rather than simply move to another form of model we follow Batchelor, Dunne and Saal (1999) and estimate the model on the manufacturing data. The order of the VAR is found to be 2 and unrestricted intercepts and no trends gives one cointegrating vector

$$qm = 1.32 k - 1.53 l + 0.50 m$$

(0.7) (2.1) (0.5)

This gives a more sensible specification with the capital coefficient positive and significant at 10%. Military spending is now positive but insignificant. The underlying ECM model is:

$$\Delta qm_t = 1.96 + 0.55 \Delta qm_{t-1} + 1.23 \Delta k_{t-1} - 0.84 \Delta l_{t-1} - 0.08 \Delta m_{t-1} + 0.16 ECM_{t-1} - 0.04 DS$$

(1.7) (3.6) (2.0) (1.6) (1.3) (1.6) (2.3)

So in this case military spending has a negative short run effect on growth.

Given the similarity of the normalised values of the coefficient on k and l a test on the cointegrating vector of $\alpha = -\beta$ in the original C-D equation seemed worthwhile. This

restriction makes output a function on the capital labour ratio and military expenditure and was accepted with $\chi^2(2) = 0.03$ giving.

$$qm = 1.23(k - l) + 0.44 m$$

(0.19) (0.09)

with asymptotic standard errors in brackets. In fact the coefficient on the capital labour ratio is not significantly different to one, $\chi^2(2) = 0.98$, giving:

$$qm = (k - l) + 0.51 m$$

(0.08)

and an error correction equation for growth:

$$\Delta qm_t = 1.31 + 0.55 \Delta qm_{t-1} + 1.02 \Delta k_{t-1} - 0.89 \Delta l_{t-1} - 0.07 \Delta m_{t-1} + 0.15 ECM_{t-1} - 0.05 DS$$

(1.7) (2.6) (1.9) (1.7) (1.3) (1.7) (2.3)

These results show a positive long run relation between military spending and manufacturing output, but a negative short run effect (significant at 10%) of the growth of military spending on the growth of manufacturing output. The composite effect of the short run coefficient on military spending and the error correction term, suggests that the short term impacts of cuts in military expenditure will at worst not be significant. In this they tend to support the results of the previous studies.

Conclusions

South Africa clearly provides an interesting case study for the analysis of the impact of military spending on growth. This paper has provided some new results and has tried to deal with some of the perceived deficiencies of previous work. Concerns about the Feder-Ram model, in terms of its specification and dynamics led to the use of an aggregate production function, estimated using cointegrating VAR methods. Concerns with the problem of undertaking the analysis at aggregate level in a country which, while a developing economy, has an advanced military industrial sector, led to a focus on manufacturing output.

When the model was estimated using GDP, the results were rather disappointing, but suggested a negative though insignificant effect of military expenditure on growth. When estimated at the level of manufacturing the results show a positive long run relation between military spending and growth, but a negative short run effect (significant at 10%). The composite effect of the short run coefficient on military spending and the error correction term, suggesting that the short term impacts of cuts in military expenditure will at worst not be significant. As we have seen most of the empirical evidence tends to suggest a negative or insignificant effect of military spending on growth in South Africa. The results of this study, while providing some advance in the econometric analysis do appear to be consistent with the previous findings.

References

- Abedian, I. and Standish, B. (eds) (1992) *Economic Growth in South Africa*, Oxford University Press: Cape Town.
- Batchelor, Peter and Paul Dunne "The Restructuring of South Africa's Defence Industry", *African Security Review*, Volume 7, no. 6, 1998.
- Batchelor, Peter, Paul Dunne and David Saal "Military Spending and Economic Growth in South Africa". *Defence and Peace Economics* Volume 11, No. 6, 2000, pp 553-571
- Benoit, E. (1978) 'Growth and Defence in LDCs', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 26 (2), 271-280
- Birdi, Alvin, J Paul Dunne and David S Saal (2000) "The Impact of Arms Production on the South African Manufacturing Industry". *Defence and Peace Economics*. Volume 11, No. 6, 2000, pp 597-613
- Biswas, B. & Ram, R. (1986) "Military Expenditures and Economic Growth in Less Developed Countries: An Augmented Model and Further Evidence", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 361-372.
- De Wet, G., E. Jonkergouw, R. Koekemoer, N. Schoeman, F. Steyn and M. Truul (1996) "The Peace Dividend in South Africa", eds N. Gleditsch et al, *The Peace Dividend*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 305-322.
- Dunne, P. (1996) "Economic Effects of Military Expenditure in Developing Countries: A Survey", eds N. Gleditsch et al, *The Peace Dividend*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 439-464.
- Dunne, Paul, Efi Nikolaidou and Andre Roux "Military Spending and Economic Growth in South Africa: A Supply and Demand Model". *Defence and Peace Economics* Volume 11, No. 6, 2000, pp 573-585.
- Dunne, Paul and Dimitrios Vougas "Military Spending and Economic Growth in South Africa: A Causal Analysis", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 43, No. 4, August 1999, pp 521-537.
- Dunne, Paul and Duncan Watson "Military Expenditure and Employment in South Africa". Forthcoming in *Defence and Peace Economics*, Volume 11, No. 6, 2000, pp 587-596.
- Fine, B. and Rustomjee, Z. 1996. *The Political Economy of South Africa: From Minerals-Energy Complex to Industrialisation* (Hurst and Company, London).
- Gleditsch, N. et al, (eds.) (1996) *The Peace Dividend*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- McMillan, S. (1992) "Economic Growth and Military Spending in South Africa", *International Interactions*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 35-50.
- Pesaran, M and B. Peasaran (1997) *Microfit 4.0*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ram,R. (1995) "Defense Expenditure and Economic Growth", eds K. Hartley and T. Sandler, *Handbook of Defense Economics Volume 1*, Elsevier: Amsterdam.

Roux, A.(1996) "Defence Expenditures and Economic Growth in South Africa,"
Journal for Studies in Economics and Econometrics, 20(1) pp. 19-34.